

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 were pending in the present application. Claims 1-21 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-21 are currently pending. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

The Office Action objected to the specification page 3, paragraph 2 and page 4, paragraph 1. Applicants have amended the specification as recommended by the Office Action, and respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

The Office Action objected to claims 6, 13, 14 and 16-21. Applicants have amended the claims as recommended by the Office Action, and respectfully request withdrawal of these objections.

The Office Action rejected claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Applicants have amended the claims generally as recommended by the Office Action, and respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention allegedly is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that “[t]he steps of creating and attaching may be interpreted as involving no more than a manipulation of an abstract idea. . . . To qualify as accomplishing a practical application, an invention must produce a ‘useful, concrete, and tangible result.’” Office Action, p. 5.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite “display the file on a display of the hand-held computer device.” Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to recite “displays the file on the display of the hand-held computer device.” Applicants have amended independent claim 15 to recite “displays the time management entry on the display of the portable computing device.” Displaying the file or time management entry on the device’s display is a useful, concrete and tangible result. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,527 (“Worthington”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154116 A1 (“Lofton”). In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly being unpatentable over Worthington in view of Lofton and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0078752 A1 (“Johnson JR”). Applicants respectfully assert that the cited prior art references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1-21.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “attach a file stored in the memory to the time management entry [[and]] display the file on a display of the hand-held computer device.” As stated in the Office Action, “Worthington does not teach: b. attach a file to the time management entry.” Office Action, p. 6. The Office Action then cites Lofton to overcome this deficiency of Worthington. Lofton, however, does not teach or suggest how to “attach a file stored in the memory to the time management entry,” as required by claim 1. In contrast, Lofton discloses a “system and method for scheduling providing an Internet-based calendar.” Lofton, Abstract. Lofton’s system generally is implemented on an Internet-based server, and is accessed by users

via the server using human interface devices or via the Internet using their individual personal computers. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, ¶¶ [0017], [0019], [0048], [0114]. Lofton’s server provides for data storage and access to multiple users along with interactivity of multiple user calendars. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, Abstract, ¶¶ [00]. With Lofton’s embodiments, separate devices store data and display the data. Again, Lofton does not teach or suggest attaching a file stored in the memory of a hand-held computer device to a time management entry, and displaying the file on a display of the hand-held computer device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, and request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art, not only because of their dependency from claim 1 for the reasons discussed above, but also in view of their novel claim features.

Amended independent claim 8 recites a software program that “attaches a file stored in the memory to the time management entry [[and]] displays the file on the display of the hand-held computer device.” As stated in the Office Action, “Worthington does not teach: b. attach a file to the time management entry.” Office Action, p. 6. The Office Action then cites Lofton to overcome this deficiency of Worthington. Lofton, however, does not teach or suggest how to attach “a file stored in the memory to the time management entry,” as required by claim 8. In contrast, Lofton discloses a “system and method for scheduling providing an Internet-based calendar.” Lofton, Abstract. Lofton’s system generally is implemented on an Internet-based server, and is accessed by users via the server using human interface devices or via the Internet using their individual personal computers. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, ¶¶ [0017], [0019], [0048], [0114]. Lofton’s server provides for data storage and access to multiple users along with interactivity of multiple user calendars. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, Abstract, ¶¶ [00]. With Lofton’s embodiments,

separate devices store data and display the data. Again, Lofton does not teach or suggest a hand-held computer device with a software program that attaches a file stored in the memory of the hand-held computer device to the time management entry and displays the file on the display of the hand-held computer device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is patentable over the cited prior art, and request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 9-14 depend from claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art, not only because of their dependency from claim 8 for the reasons discussed above, but also in view of their novel claim features.

Amended independent claim 15 recites a software program that “attaches a file stored in the memory to the time management entry [[and]] displays the time management entry on the display of the portable computing device.” As stated in the Office Action, “Worthington does not teach: b. attach a file to the time management entry.” Office Action, p. 6. The Office Action then cites Lofton to overcome this deficiency of Worthington. Lofton, however, does not teach or suggest how to attach “a file stored in the memory to the time management entry,” as required by claim 15. In contrast, Lofton discloses a “system and method for scheduling providing an Internet-based calendar.” Lofton, Abstract. Lofton’s system generally is implemented on an Internet-based server, and is accessed by users via the server using human interface devices or via the Internet using their individual personal computers. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, ¶¶ [0017], [0019], [0048], [0114]. Lofton’s server provides for data storage and access to multiple users along with interactivity of multiple user calendars. *See, e.g.*, Lofton, Abstract, ¶¶ [00]. With Lofton’s embodiments, separate devices store data and display the data. Again, Lofton does not teach or suggest a hand-held computer device with a software program that attaches a file stored in the memory to the time management entry and displays the time management entry on the display of

the portable computing device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is patentable over the cited prior art, and request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 16-21 depend from claim 15. Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art, not only because of their dependency from claim 15 for the reasons discussed above, but also in view of their novel claim features.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, however, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney, Jim Brady, at 972-917-4371 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. In the event that any fees are due, please charge any additional fees required to keep this application pending, or credit any overpayment to, Deposit Account No. 50-1065.

Respectfully submitted,

March 27, 2008
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Brian A. Carlson/
Brian A. Carlson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,793